

ER

OLL 85-3601  
20 November 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: See Distribution

FROM:

[Redacted]  
Chief, Legislation Division  
Office of Legislative Liaison

STAT

SUBJECT:

House Floor Action & Passage of Conference  
Report on FY '86 Intelligence Authorization  
Act - H.Rept.No. 99-373

1. Attached for your information is a copy of pages H 10293 to H 10298 from the Congressional Record of November 19, 1985. These pages reflect House floor action on, and passage of, House Report No. 99-373, the conference report on H.R. 2419, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986.

2. Senate floor action may occur as early as today.

STAT

Attachment:  
as stated



L-114

**Distribution:**

**Original - OLL/LEG/Subject: 1987 Legislative Program**

- 1 - SWH and PS Signer
- 1 - Director, Office of Security
- 1 - Director, Office of Personnel
- 1 - Inspector General
- 1 - Office of Comptroller
- 1 - Office of General Counsel
- 1 - DDI
- 1 - DDO
- 1 - DDS&T
- 1 - DDA
- ✓ 1 - Executive Registry
- 1 - C/Liaison/OLL
- 1 - D/OLL
- 1 - DD/OLL
- 1 - C/LIT/OGC
- 1 - C/ALD/OGC
- 1 - C/PCS/DDO
- 1 - Special Assistant to the DO
- 1 - C/SE/DO
- 1 -
- 1 -
- 1 - AA/OSD/OGC
- 1 - AA/PCS/DO

STAT

STAT

LEG/OLL:  ps (20 Nov 1985)

November 19, 1985

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10293

number and type of ships planned for each port and the overall plan for facility development, including costs. The plan should describe the entire deployment as well as that portion necessary for initial operating capability (IOC). No funds authorized by this act may be obligated or expended until 90 days after the Congress receives this report.

I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make three points.

No. 1, with respect to the recent debate on the issue of homeporting, I would simply say that it points up that it is terribly important that this body address these issues on a policy basis. It is clear that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Armed Services Committee has a clear and present interest in this issue.

The Chair would also suggest that the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities also has a significant interest in the policy considerations of whether we shall or shall not engage in the activity of homeporting, because we will be, on an increasing basis, bombarded with requests for construction associated with homeporting.

It was in the interest of those of us on the subcommittee that we enter into that debate intelligently and on an informed basis. That is why we asked for the information, so that we can more intelligently deliberate whether or not proceeding along the lines to homeporting is indeed in the best interests of the United States at a variety of different levels, including the question of economics.

Second, I would like to point out, reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that we went to conference with the other body with over 300 items in disagreement. I would be derelict in my responsibilities if I did not point out the incredible diligent work on the part of those members of the staff on both sides of the aisle who helped cull that list of 300 differences down to a manageable list that the Members of the House and the other body could deal with in the conference. Had it not been for their hard work, long hours, tremendous commitment, we never could have brought this conference report in this short time frame. So the Chair wishes to go on record thanking the members of the staff and simply pointing out that in this institution, given the incredible amount of information that we must attempt to absorb, the extraordinary amount of work that we must engage in at different times, the bottom line is we are often only as good as our staff, and we think that we have an extraordinarily competent and capable staff.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this statement; as I indicated before, the only two differences that exist in this bill, with the exception of a few adjustments here and there, are two items. The sum of \$18.9 million is authorized in the conference report for support facilities associated with

the deployment of the cruise missile in the Netherlands. That was not in the bill that left the House because the position at that time was to take a wait-and-see attitude with respect to the response of the Government of the Netherlands, that has now taken the position that they shall go forward with deployment.

The second item is a \$8 million item, and the \$8 million item deals with the construction of the binary chemical weapons facility which would take into it the \$40 million of equipment that the House conferees agreed to when they agreed to the conference on the Senate bill, S. 1160. As one of my distinguished colleagues from the other side of the aisle pointed out that she was very much concerned that the House conferees watered down the more stringent language that had been embodied in the first bill passing the House, nevertheless, that became a reality, and in the humble opinion of the Chair, politics outran logic, and we are in with these two facilities.

We would simply like to point out in summary that those Members who supported the bill when it left the House can support this conference report. I did not support the bill when it left the House, although I chaired the committee that brought the bill.

My simple logic in that respect is this is not the gentleman from California's bill. I simply have the responsibility, and I cherish that responsibility that has been bestowed upon me by my colleagues, and that is simply to guide a process. But this bill is the consensus of a number of Members, and this is a group process. No one individual can in any way dominate this process.

At the end of it, I simply stepped out of the chair and said, can I support the policies upon which this bill is framed if I were not in the chair. My answer was no. Putting myself back in the chair does not change that.

I would like to say there are some good things in this bill that we will continue to hammer home, and that is the quality of life. There has been too much preoccupation with the technology of death on the floor of this Congress and not enough attention to the human side of the military. What we try to do in rationalizing, in allocating the cuts in fiscal year 1986 is to make a stronger statement on the issue of the quality of life. Therefore, we have more money in here for family housing, for single bachelor quarters, for community facilities, for childcare facilities, for health facilities, and that is consistent with enhancing the quality of life of our colleagues.

So for those Members who ask me should I vote for the bill because you brought it, my answer is no. You vote for the bill because you are either agreeing with it or you vote against it because you do not agree with it.

It is the intention of the Chair to oppose the bill, not because here are some good things in the bill, but this

bill is still based upon assumptions that we must prepare for war as a way of achieving peace, and we must continue to escalate our armaments. I do not think that is appropriate.

I hope things happen marvelously at the summit. I am not going to hold my breath on that, but I hope it does take place.

In the meantime, it is our responsibility to reflect the will of our constituency, and reflect the integrity of our political perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we have no more requests for time. I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2419) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, for the Intelligence Community Staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 14, 1985.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STROM) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the principal means by which the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence exercises oversight

H 10294

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 19, 1985

every year. We make decisions about intelligence programs, priorities, and practices. I believe we will have strengthened the intelligence community, and the process by which we conduct that oversight, through the passage of this act and by some of the positive and helpful provisions which it includes. I want to thank all members of the committee for their hard work and dedication, and particularly Bos STUMP, the ranking minority member, and Lou STOKES, the chairman of the Budget Subcommittee. I also thank all our staff for their skillful and cooperative assistance. They are, in every respect, professionals.

The amounts which the conference report authorizes for intelligence and intelligence-related activities are contained in a classified schedule of authorizations that is incorporated by reference. An explanation of those actions is to be found in a Classified Annex to the Joint Statement of Managers. Both are available in the offices of the Intelligence Committee to any Member of the House who desires to examine them.

The amounts authorized for intelligence and intelligence-related activities represent a compromise favorable to the House position. Although this conference agreement does provide for real growth in important sectors of the intelligence budget, overall and also with respect to specific programs, it institutes a regime of fiscal restraint in intelligence spending. Such restraint is consistent with the budget pressures that apply to all federal activities. Nonetheless, intelligence funding is given priority within the national security budget function that reflects its essential contributions to the national defense.

With respect to legislative provisions, Members will note that your conferees have essentially preserved the approach of the house with respect to Nicaragua. The House conferees, in their discussions with the Senate, made clear that we should be guided by two principles in our resolution of the Nicaragua issues. One, that authorizations in this act should be limited as far as possible to intelligence activities and second, that any major changes in Nicaragua policy must come as a result of a Presidential request, and votes in both the House and Senate concerning that request. Major changes should not come in this bill. The provisions of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 1985 and the International Security and Development Cooperation Act both provide for an expedited mandatory vote on such a Presidential request. It is my expectation that such a request will be forthcoming in the near future.

An agreement on Nicaragua did not come easily. There were those on the other side who had wished to return to the status quo ante 1983. The House conferees made clear that this was not possible. We were able to reach a com-

promise whose principle elements include:

Authorization for the provision of information and advice to the Contras. However, training, or any other activities—including advice—that amount to participation in the planning or execution of military activities by the Contras, or acting as military advisors to the Contras, is prohibited.

A limited amount of communications equipment and related training will be provided to the Contras to facilitate the exchange of information and intelligence that has been authorized. The amount for the communications equipment is small. It is contained in the classified schedule of authorizations at the insistence of the Senate but that amount is available to any Member who chooses to go up to the Intelligence Committee or who wishes to ask me privately here on the floor.

An important element of our agreement is that no other expenditures for any other assistance for military or paramilitary operations by the Contras is permitted without congressional approval of either a reprogramming or a transfer.

The CIA's reserve for contingencies and, in fact, any other contingency funds of the intelligence community, are not available for additional expenditures to support the military or paramilitary operations of the Contras except through a reprogramming or transfer of funds approved by the Congress.

The conferees also believe that transportation assistance may be provided to the Contras under the provisions of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985. This means that, of the \$27 million already appropriated for humanitarian assistance to the Contras, some of these funds may be expended for the provision of transportation assistance to the Contras.

Also, the conferees agreed the State Department may solicit, through its normal diplomatic contacts, humanitarian assistance from other foreign countries of the same type as is authorized by the Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1985. No other department or agency involved in intelligence activities may engage in any type of solicitation, for the Contras.

Mr. Speaker, the wording of the Nicaraguan provision in section 105 of the conference report is drafted in a different form than previous statutory limitations on aid to the Contras. Members should understand that the use of the word "only" in new section 105 has the meaning and effect that the phrase "directly or indirectly" had in previous statutory expressions. Further, section 105 is intended by the conferees to establish and clarify, as appropriate, policy for intelligence agencies with respect to assistance to the Contras.

There are several other key legislative provisions in the conference report which are worthy of note. The

Senate has agreed to two provisions in the House bill—one which requires that all funds spent for intelligence activities have been specifically authorized by law; and, two, a provision which requires large covert transfers of military equipment to be reported to the Intelligence Committees. Such transfers are significant events in the foreign policy of the United States, and they should be subjected to careful scrutiny by the Congress.

The conferees also accepted four Senate amendments. The first provides expedited citizenship for a limited number of important intelligence agents who meet all the conditions for citizenship except those applying to residency and physical presence in the United States. The conferees have insisted on a requirement of 1 year's residency and have further provided that those involved in persecution be precluded from qualifying under this section.

Another Senate amendment permits the CIA, DOD, and OPM to gain access to State and local criminal history records for security checks. This provision was amended as a result of full consultation with the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, some of whose Members served as conferees. The result of conference action is one with which both the States and the Department of Defense, in particular, are pleased. The conferees agreed to deny the use of this provision for recruitment and they have reaffirmed the requirement that such access be premised upon the consent of the individual whose records are being sought, and the right of that individual to have access to records that are provided to the Government pursuant to this section.

Two other Senate-originated provisions deserve notice. The conferees agreed to authorize for 1 year the use by DOD of the proceeds of its counterintelligence investigation in other counterintelligence investigations, suspending for the period the requirement that such funds be returned to the Treasury. This is 1-year authority similar to authority now used by the FBI. It does not involve large sums. There are some concerns within the committee about this procedure. There will be attentive oversight to it in the upcoming year.

Finally, the conferees agreed to provide to CIA personnel stationed overseas extra retirement credits for service at unhealthful posts identical to credits now enjoyed by Foreign Service Officers in identical positions.

Mr. Speaker, that is a summary of the action of the conference committee. The committee met several times and reached an amicable and constructive agreement on the provisions I have described. Those meetings and the committee's budget review beginning early this year convinced me of several things.

November 19, 1985

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10295

First, the need within the U.S. Government for high-quality intelligence is greater than ever before. The members of the Intelligence Committee believe that the United States cannot survive without good intelligence. Further, the need for continuous oversight over the proliferating number of intelligence activities of the Government is stronger than ever. The House and Senate Intelligence Committees provide the only check on intelligence agencies outside the executive branch. Third, the committee's job in the future of authorizing funds for intelligence activities is going to be more difficult during a period of budgetary restraint and high intelligence demand. Our job in the future will be tougher.

Let me close with an observation which, although not directly raised by this conference report, is important to your acceptance of the committee's judgments concerning that report. I want to assure the House that the security of your Intelligence Committee is good. I am not aware of a single, proven leak from the committee. We are very sensitive about the need for security, and we remain alert to ways to maintain and strengthen that security. There has been considerable public discussion lately about intelligence and its oversight. Your committee is proceeding carefully, responsibly, and quietly. In my view, and in the view of the majority of the committee, this is the responsible way to proceed in order to best fulfill our oversight functions.

Mr. Speaker, on page 8 of the conference report as printed, section 801, which deals with access to criminal history records, creates a new subpart H of part III of title 5, United States Code. On page 10, however, this provision is referred to in amending the table of contents of part III of title 5 as subpart "G." This latter reference is an error. It should read "subpart H." Similarly, the table of contents provision incorrectly lists the chapter heading. All of these errors in the printed version appear correctly in the enrolled bill.

□ 1000

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Permanent House Select Committee for yielding, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and also the Members who serve on this committee for the hard work in which they were engaged in in the conference and for its obviously successful outcome.

I want to draw attention particularly to the closing remarks of the distinguished chairman, particularly in reference to his statement about leaks.

During my tenure as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I rarely made statements

to the press. That was not because I always believed that the intelligence community was right in its judgments or that it was acting appropriately at all times.

However, I did not find it necessary to proclaim publicly every disagreement with the intelligence agencies. It is my judgment that oversight during that same period by the Committee on Intelligence was vigorous and it was effective.

I believe the committee maintained good relations with the intelligence community, even though on occasion it had significant disagreements. I do not believe that it is helpful or appropriate for Members of Congress who sit on oversight committees to regularly or recklessly comment on intelligence matters, either critically or favorably.

The subject matter simply does not lend itself to regular public comment, nor does such comment greatly improve, in my judgment, the oversight of intelligence activities.

I also do not suggest a gag rule. Far from it. Public expressions of dismay following a failure to communicate significant intelligence information to the Congress are sometimes necessary but must always be carefully considered.

I do not believe that much of the discussion in the press of late falls within that category.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana and the other Members who serve on that committee in my view have continued the careful, fair tradition for which the Intelligence Committee on this side of the Congress has been known. He brings to his stewardship of the committee the reputation for thoughtful and honest commentary.

I applaud him for his responsible handling of many recent intelligence issues about which there seems to have been such considerable utterances in other parts of this city.

I believe also his record and the record of that committee in this area is reflective of the excellent security practices for which the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has always been known.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman from Massachusetts to know how deeply I appreciate his comments. All of us in this House know that he really is Mr. Intelligence of the House of Representatives, because of his distinguished and meritorious service as chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the minority supports the conference report, which provides the appropriate level of resources for the Nation's intelligence and intelligence-related activities. The minority

is concerned, however, that section 105 of conference report does not allow the full support to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance necessary to bring about a national reconciliation in Nicaragua and an end to Communist adventurism. Fortunately, the Congress will have the opportunity in the coming months to restore full support for the resistance. Aside from the Nicaragua provision, the conference report is an excellent piece of legislation, and it deserves the agreement of the House.

In addition to authorizing appropriations for U.S. intelligence activities. The conference report includes several important legislative items. I am particularly pleased with the Immigration and Naturalization Act amendments which will permit expedited naturalization of deserving intelligence sources when they come to the United States at the end of their secret intelligence service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my full appreciation to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, LEE HAMILTON, and the Program and Budget Subcommittee Chairman, LOU STOKES, for their fine leadership and great courtesy. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with them to ensure the availability of resources for intelligence programs critical to the national security. I also wish to thank the committee staff and especially the budget staff for their fine and professional work in support of the committee.

□ 1010

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 3419. I want to recognize the work of Mr. HAMILTON and to thank him and our ranking minority member, Mr. STUMP, for all the effort they have put forth in producing this bill and conference report.

I am well satisfied with the outcome of this conference. The House made significant reductions in funding for intelligence programs and about 85 percent of those reductions were retained in conference. Intelligence has enjoyed a number of years of significant budget growth. This year that growth was substantially slowed. Importantly, I believe that the Director of Central Intelligence and other officials of the administration understand that these limitations must be imposed.

With regard to our agreement on Nicaragua, I want to point out that the House conferees do not pretend that the action taken solves the Nica-



H 10296

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 19, 1985

ragua problem or sets out a foreign policy regarding Nicaragua or Central America. That was not our intention. We restricted our actions to those involving intelligence issues.

The program to which we agreed is very limited; indeed, far more limited than that which the administration and some conferees desired.

The approval of communications equipment was seen by the House conferees as a logical extension of the position already approved by the House to provide intelligence advice to the Contras. The communications equipment merely provides a means by which this may practically be done.

Members will recognize that the important change in the structure of our Nicaragua position in this bill compared to last year is that we have provided very limited and specific authorization as opposed to a specific prohibition as in previous bills.

The statement of managers provides that the CIA cannot augment the program through the use of its reserve for contingencies. Modification of the program can occur only through a reprogramming action. I want to assure my colleagues that a reprogramming is not a vehicle by which we expect or intend for this program to again become a U.S.-run or a U.S.-supported covert war. I do not foresee a program beyond the type we are authorizing here, unless the matter is again brought before the House in some fashion. That is a procedure to which I am committed and to which Chairman HAMILTON is committed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2419 is a good bill, and I urge approval of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CHENEY].

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2419.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good bill. A great deal of the effort that went into it deserves the support of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to begin my remarks today by endorsing wholeheartedly the statement of Mr. BOLAND the gentleman from Massachusetts in the well a moment ago. I think he is absolutely correct that certain restraints should be recognized and honored by members of the Select Committee on Intelligence in both Houses, that if a Member seeks publicity and public awareness of all that he does, perhaps he should find service on some other committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the House Intelligence Committee have done an outstanding job of honoring those commitments. I would like to join in the general praise for the chairman of our committee, Mr. HAMILTON, and the ranking member, Mr. STUMP, for the way in which they con-

ducted themselves and led the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I signed the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, with reluctance, the minority members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence signed the conference report on H.R. 2419, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. While we support wholeheartedly the vast majority of U.S. intelligence programs and the associated funding levels contained in H.R. 2419, one provision of the conference report is of special concern. The conference report does not provide the necessary support for the President's program to achieve national reconciliation in Nicaragua and an end to Soviet-Cuban sponsored Communist adventurism in Central America. Instead, it continues to contain counterproductive restrictions on aid to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance.

The Republican Members fully supported the President's request for funding to support United States foreign policy in Nicaragua. We set forth at great length in the minority views to the House Intelligence Committee report on H.R. 2419—House Report 99-106, part 1—the critical need to support the President's policy with respect to Nicaragua.

The situation in Nicaragua has grown even worse since we penned those views. The Sandinistas have eliminated any pretense of civil liberties in Nicaragua, and instead have officially and formally suspended such liberties.

The primary virtue of section 105 of the conference report is that it is not as bad as the blanket prohibition on aid to the Nicaraguan Resistance which it replaces: the Boland prohibition in section 8066(a) of the DOD Appropriations Act, 1985 and section 801 of the fiscal year 1985 Intelligence Authorization Act. Section 105 represents a small step forward toward full support for the resistance by permitting cooperation in the areas of information sharing, advice, transportation, and humanitarian aid. On that basis, we reluctantly accept the provision.

We continue to believe that it is essential to our national interest to give full support to the Nicaraguan resistance. We urge the President to renew his request to the Congress for such full support in the near future through the appropriate mechanisms.

The United States faces the supreme test of its ability to advance the interests of freedom in the face of the expansion of Communism close to home. Our national interest requires both that we avoid a war involving the U.S. Armed Forces and that we effectively resist the establishment and expansion of Communism on the mainland of the Americas. Accordingly, giving full support to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance is the wisest course.

Members of this House should not mistake the strategic importance of this test in Central America. The

United States faces challenges around the globe from Soviet-sponsored insurgencies. The Soviets and their cohorts believe that the United States cannot muster the national will to resist attacks on free nations which come not through conventional attack in the manner of traditional warfare, but instead come in the form of insurgencies involving low and medium-intensity conflict engaged in by Soviet proxies. Such insurgencies employ slow and steady military and political efforts to achieve an objective in circumstances in which direct and open warfare would stimulate an overwhelming counterresponse. No one can doubt that, if the Soviet Union invaded Central America to impose its iron will on the people of Central America, the United States would use its military might to repel that invasion. Yet, if we do not soon renew full support for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance, the Soviets will achieve the same end through their puppets, the so-called Sandinista National Liberation Front which seized power in 1979 and currently rules Nicaragua.

If the Soviets become firmly convinced that the United States lacks the will to resist their efforts to expand communism through the military and political efforts of their Marxist-Leninist clients, the result will be grave indeed for United States interests, not only in Nicaragua, but around the globe.

We look forward to the opportunity in the next few months to renew the public and congressional debate on aid to the Nicaraguan resistance. We are confident that, when the Congress addresses this issue in the near future, it will remove the restrictions which hobble the President in protecting United States interests in Central America, and restore full support to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue to which I have devoted a lot of thought and emotional energy and one which I feel very strongly about.

We made a decision in this House last June to take a different course than what we had been charting the 3 previous years. What transpired in the conference on this issue is a blending of thought from this body and from the other body.

I have mixed feelings about that. I regret the expansion of the intelligence activities that are contained in this report. I am concerned about the use of trucks, radio equipment, and other things to facilitate the Contras' war against the people and the Government of Nicaragua. I am troubled each and every day when I pick up the morning newspaper to read of the literal slaughter of innocents in that troubled region of the world. But I



H 10298

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 19, 1985

Smith (FL)	Stump	Watkins
Smith (IA)	Sundquist	Waxman
Smith (NE)	Sweeney	Weber
Smith (NJ)	Swift	Wheat
Smith, Denny	Synar	Whitehurst
(OR)	Tallion	Whitley
Smith, Robert	Tauke	Whittaker
(NH)	Tausin	Whitten
Smith, Robert	Taylor	Williams
(OR)	Thomas (CA)	Wilson
Snowe	Thomas (GA)	Wirth
Snyder	Torres	Wise
Soiarz	Torricelli	Wolf
Solomon	Towns	Wolpe
Spencer	Trafficant	Wortley
Spratt	Traxler	Wright
S. Germain	Udall	Wyden
Staggers	Valentine	Wyllie
Stallings	Vander Jagt	Yates
Stangeland	Visclosky	Yatron
Stark	Volkmer	Young (AK)
Stenholm	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Stokes	Walgren	Young (MO)
Strang	Walker	Zachau

## NAYS—21

Bedell	Gonzalez	Owens
Clay	Hayes	Rangel
Conyers	Lowry (WA)	Selberling
Crockett	Miller (CA)	Studds
Dellums	Moody	Vento
Dymally	Morrison (CT)	Weaver
Garcia	Murphy	Weiss

## NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Bartnett	Mitchell
Addabbo	Beffel	Nelson
AuCoin	Holt	Price
Bosco	Hubbard	Quillen
Breaux	Hyde	Roe
Burton (CA)	Lehman (CA)	Savage
Chapple	Lewis (CA)	Stratton
de la Garza	Loeffler	Swindall
Dingell	McKinney	

□ 1640

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Nelson of Florida for, with Mr. Savage against.

Mr. HAYES and Mr. MOODY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. LATTA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

**MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1985, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1714, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986**

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1714 at any time tomorrow,

Wednesday, November 20, 1985, or any time thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

## REPUBLICAN SOCIAL POLICY AGENDA

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined with 17 of my Republican colleagues in releasing an important report on social policy. This is the first in a series of four reports by the House Wednesday Group as part of its project called a Republican agenda for 1985 and beyond.

Our report provides an important statement concerning the overall direction of Federal social policy. The report covers such areas as civil rights, families and child care, educational opportunities, welfare, employment flexibility, and health.

Beyond its important findings and recommendations, our report speaks to many of the principles that should govern our Nation's social policy. We talk about enabling people, rather than fostering dependence. We talk about protecting individual rights and choices. We affirm the important role of Government programs, but we also affirm the important role of Government leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical statement about the direction of America's social policy; it is critical because our society demands creative initiatives to address our Nation's social problems; and it is critical because Congress will shortly be making many difficult fiscal choices and cannot ignore their social policy implications.

I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to take a serious look at this report, and to join together in building a consensus on the policies and programs that will comprise our Nation's future social policy agenda.

THE HOUSE WEDNESDAY GROUP,  
Washington, DC, November 13, 1985.

## CONGRESSIONAL REPORT PROPOSES REPUBLICAN SOCIAL POLICY AGENDA

"While federal social programs provide some measure of relief to those in need, relief is only the first part, of what should be a two-part federal strategy . . . federal policy should promote not only relief but rehabilitation approaches to the problems of the poor, the unemployed, the welfare-dependent, or the otherwise socially disabled . . ." asserts a report on social policy released by a group of House Republicans known as the House Wednesday Group.

Prepared by Dr. Joyce Van Dyke, under the direction of the Wednesday Group's Task Force on Social Policy—which included Dr. Henry Aaron and Dr. Paul Peterson of the Brookings Institution; Dr. Douglas Bailey, former Wednesday Group executive director and currently with Bailey, Dear-dourff and Associates, Inc.; and Mr. Martin Gerry, former Assistant Secretary in the

Department of Health and Human Services under Presidents Ford and Nixon—this report is the first in a series of four reports which the Wednesday Group will issue as part of a project called a Republican Agenda for 1985 and Beyond.

Members of Congress releasing the report include: Bill Clinger (PA), Ross Chandler (WA), Silvio Conte (MA), Lawrence Coughlin (PA), Hamilton Fish (NY), Bill Green (NY), Paul Henry (MI), Frank Horton (NY), Jim Jeffords (VT), Nancy Johnson (CT), Jim Leach (IA), John McKernan (ME), Stewart McKinney (CT), Thomas Petri (WI), Ralph Regula (OH), Tom Ridge (PA), Claudine Schneider (RI), and Tom Tauke (IA).

The report covers such important topics as civil rights, families and child care, educational opportunities, welfare, employment flexibility, and health.

According to Congressman Bill Clinger, Chairman of the Wednesday Group, "Today's report provides an important statement concerning the overall direction of federal social policy. In this regard, our report is also a Republican statement. Although we speak neither for the National Republican Party nor the Wednesday Group as a whole, we as individual Republican Members of Congress have come together in support of an agenda for certain reforms, as well as an approach we believe to be important to the vitality of American social policy."

In the area of civil rights, the report asserts that "currently, lack of coordination and consistency in Federal civil rights laws present a significant barrier to ensuring equal opportunity and social justice." The report recommends that the coverage, investigative procedures, and remedies of all Federal civil rights laws be standardized. It also recommends that enforcement of these laws be centralized and made mandatory once a finding of "reasonable cause" has been reached.

The report also recommends that Congress "cap or reduce eligibility for the Dependent Care Tax Credit for upper-income taxpayers and use the money saved to fund more child care for low-income workers who can not take advantage of the tax credit. . . This action would provide child care services to those most in need, working parents who earn too little to be able to take advantage of the dependent care tax credit."

On the topic of welfare, the report asks Congress to "increase the proportion of model and demonstration programs designed to help welfare-dependent adults (most of them women) to become economically self-sufficient and able to support their families." As the report notes: "welfare need not and should not retain its antiquated status as a pure relief program, but should provide both relief and a transition to the world of work and economic independence."

Beyond its important findings and recommendations, the report speaks to many of the principles that should govern our nation's social policy. As Representative Clinger observed: "We talk about enabling people, rather than fostering dependence. We talk about promoting family stability and integrity. We talk about protecting individual rights and choices. We affirm the important role of government programs, but also affirm the important role of government leadership."